

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant: David A. Edwards et al.  
Serial No.: 09/411,792  
Confirmation No.: 8808  
Filed: October 1, 1999  
For: INTERFACE FOR TRANSFERRING DEBUG INFORMATION  
Examiner: T. T. Vo  
Art Unit: 2191

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed July 13, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. To further the prosecution of this application, each of the rejections set forth in the Office Action has been carefully considered and is addressed below. The application as presented is believed to be in condition for allowance.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as purportedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,737,516 (referred to in the Office Action, and hereinafter, as “MotorolaPAT”) and “Debug Support on the ColdFire Architecture,” by Hohl, et. al. (referred to in the Office Action, and hereinafter, as “MotorolaNPL”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

**A. Multiple Reference Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Initially, Applicants note that claims 1-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 using two references. In support of this rejection, the Office Action cites MPEP §2131.01 which indicates that, although normally only one reference should be used in making a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102, there are three situations in which a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 that relies on multiple references has been held to be proper. These situations are when the extra reference(s) are cited